

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed May 16, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Claims 1-38, which were previously pending in this application, are cancelled. Claims 39-47 had previously been withdrawn. New claims 48-66 have been added. As a result, claims 48-66 are pending for examination, with claims 48 and 66 being independent. No new matter has been added. The claims as presented are believed to be in condition for allowance.

New Claims

During previous prosecution of this application, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-38, directed to methods and apparatus for performing context management using a server appliance or web server, were not patentable. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicant presents new claims 48-66 to more broadly capture the concept of performing context management over a network. As discussed in detail below, the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest performing context management over a network.

Claims 48-66 Are Patentable Over The Prior Art Of Record

Claim 48 recites a method for use in a computer system comprising at least a first computer, a second computer and a network that couples the first and second computers. The method comprises an act of: (A) sharing a context between at least first and second applications, the first application having a first user interface executing on the first computer, the second application having a second user interface executing on the first computer, the sharing of the context comprising passing context information over the network between the first user interface and a context manager executing on the second computer and between a second user interface and the context manager.

The prior art of record (i.e., U.S. Patent No. 5,664,109 to Johnson et al. ("Johnson"), U.S. Patent No. 6,345,294 to O'Toole et al ("O'Toole") and U.S. Patent No. 6,401,138 to Judge et al. ("Judge")) fails to disclose or suggest the limitations recited by claim 48. For example, Johnson discloses a system which includes a repository for storing documents received from medical service providers (Abstract). Upon receipt of a document, the system automatically extracts

information (e.g., demographic information identifying a patient) from the document and matches this information to data stored in the repository (col. 2, lines 17-19). The document is stored in the repository and linked with other information on the patient so that records relating to the patient may be more easily accessed by a variety of providers (col. 2, lines 16-29). Johnson does not, however, disclose or suggest sharing a context between at least first and second applications having respective first and second user interfaces executing on a first computer, wherein the sharing of the context comprises passing context information over a network between the first user interface and a context manager executing on a second computer and between the second user interface and the context manager, as recited in claim 48.

O'Toole also fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 48. O'Toole discloses a network appliance capable of remote booting and configuration, such that the appliance may be shipped to a remote location and set up by personnel who are unfamiliar with configuring a network appliance (Abstract). O'Toole makes no disclosure or suggestion related to context management at all, let alone sharing a context in the manner recited by claim 48.

Judge also fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 48. Judge discloses a system for managing context between applications running on a single desktop, using code resident in a dynamic link library resident on the desktop (col. 8, lines 1-7). Thus, Judge discloses a context manager that runs on the same desktop as the applications that it manages in sharing context. Judge discloses or suggests nothing at all related to performing context management over a network, and certainly not in the manner recited in claim 48.

Because the limitations of claim 48 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, claim 48 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 49-65 depend from claim 48 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 66 recites a method for use in a system comprising a first computer, a second computer, and a network that couples the first and second computers. The method comprises an act of: (A) sharing a context between at least the first and second applications having respective first and second user interfaces executing on the first computer, the second application executing on the second computer, the sharing of the context comprising passing context information between the first user interface and the context manager and between the second application and the context manager.

It should be clear from the discussion above that the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 66. None of the cited references disclose or suggest sharing a context between first and second applications having respective first and second user interfaces executing on a first computer, wherein the second application executes on the second computer, and the sharing of the context comprises passing context information between the first user interface and the context manager and between the second application and the context manager. For example, as discussed above, Judge discloses a context manager which manages context between applications executing on the same computer. Therefore, Judge does not disclose passing context information between a first user interface and the context manager and between the second application, executing on a second computer, and the context manager.

Johnson and O'Toole also fail to disclose or suggest anything at all related to performing context management over a network, and certainly not in the manner recited in claim 66. As discussed above, Johnson discloses a repository for storing documents received from medical service providers, and O'Toole discloses a network appliance capable of remote booting and configuration.

Because the limitations of claim 66 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, claim 66 is patentable over the prior art of record.


Claim 67 depends from claim 66 and is patentable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert Seliger, Applicant

By: 
Richard F. Giunta, Reg. No. 36,149
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
Telephone: (617) 646-8000

Docket No.: S1389.70009US00
Date: August 16, 2005,
x08/16/05x